

REMARKS

Status of the Claims:

Claims 1 – 10 and 76 – 80 are pending.

Claims 1 – 10 are currently rejected.

Claims 11 – 75 are cancelled.

Claims 1 – 10 are currently amended.

Claims 76 – 80 are new claims.

Amendments to the Claims:

No new matter has been introduced by way of the claim amendments.

All of the pending claims have been amended to recite that the claimed ink is a fluorescent ink, rather than a nanotube ink. This amendment has been made for the purpose of clarity.

Claim 1 has been rewritten in response to the Examiner's rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended to recite the fluorescent ink comprises suspended carbon nanotubes and a solvent. Support for this amendment may be found in at least Claims 1 and 7 as originally filed and paragraphs [0009] and [0040]. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the suspended carbon nanotubes comprise fluorescent carbon nanotubes. Support for this amendment may be found in at least paragraphs [0028], [0040] and [0047]. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the fluorescent carbon nanotubes have a visible excitation and an emission following the visible excitation. Support for this claim amendment may be found in at least paragraph [0015]. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the fluorescent ink is deposited on a surface and the solvent is evaporated from the surface. Support for these claim amendments may be found in at least Claim 1 as originally filed and paragraphs [0025], [0046], [0054], [0055] and [0056].

Claim 5 has been amended in response to an objection to the specification cited by the Examiner. Claim 5 has been amended to match language currently in the specification, rather than amending the specification itself. Support for the amendment to claim 5 may be found in at least

paragraph [0039].

Claim 6 has been rewritten in response to the Examiner's rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the fluorescent carbon nanotubes comprise separated carbon nanotubes, and the separated carbon nanotubes have fluorescence properties tuned within a range of excitation and emission wavelengths. Support for these amendments may be found in at least paragraphs [0014] and [0015].

Claims 2 – 4 and 7 – 10 have been amended in order to have proper antecedent support from the preceding claim, as amended, from which each claim depends. All other amendments to the claims not otherwise specified above have been made for stylistic purposes or to improve clarity.

Claims 76 – 80 are new claims. Support for new claim 76 may be found in at least paragraph [0055]. Support for new claim 77 may be found in at least paragraphs [0013] and [0041]. Support for new claim 78 may be found in at least paragraphs [0040] and [0045]. Support for new claim 79 may be found in at least paragraphs [0012] and [0039]. Support for new claim 80 may be found in at least paragraphs [0015], [0055], [0070] and [0071].

I. Amendments to the Claims filed July 9, 2008

The Examiner has stated that the amendments to the claims filed July 9, 2008 do not comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121(c) because the claims include previous amendment markings. Office Action page 2.

Applicants acknowledge that the previous listing of the claims filed July 9, 2008 contained improper amendment markings, which were inadvertently retained from an earlier amendment. Other than cancelling non-elected claims, the listing of the claims submitted on July 9, 2008 was otherwise unchanged from the earlier amendment. Applicants submit that the listing of the claims provided in this paper includes a complete listing of the claims as presently amended.

II. Information Disclosure Statement Deficiencies

The Examiner has pointed out various deficiencies in the Information Disclosure Statements filed December 27, 2007 and July 9, 2008. Office Action pages 3 – 4. The Examiner has stated that these Information Disclosure Statements are lacking because the required titles and publication month,

where appropriate, are missing. The Examiner has stated that these Information Disclosure Statements have been placed in the application file, but the information therein has not been considered on the merits. The Examiner has also stated the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 27, 2007 is non-compliant, since the reference PCT/US04/24507 is an application and not a published reference. The Examiner has stated that the Information Disclosure Statement has been placed in the application file, but the information therein has not been considered on the merits. The Examiner has stated that Information Disclosure Statement filed July 9, 2008 is non-compliant, since a complete and legible copy of Japanese Patent JP 2003-26981 cited in the Information Disclosure Statement was not submitted. Applicants previously submitted the abstract of JP 2003-26981. The Examiner has stated that the Information Disclosure Statement has been placed in the application file, but the information therein has not been considered on the merits.

Applicants acknowledge the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Corrected copies of the Information Disclosure Statements are being submitted by the Applicants.

III. Priority Claim Under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e)

The Examiner has acknowledged Applicants' claim for priority benefit of earlier-filed United States provisional patent application 60/500,394 under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). The Examiner has stated that Applicants have not complied with one or more conditions to receive the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). Office Action pages 4 – 5.

The Examiner has stated that United States provisional patent application 60/500,394 provides adequate support for the subject matter of claims 3, 5 and 10; the embodiments of claims 1 and 2, wherein the carbon nanotubes are single-walled; the embodiments of claim 7, wherein the liquid medium is water, organic solvents and combinations thereof; and the embodiment of claim 8, wherein the liquid medium is water. The Examiner has stated that this group of subject matter has an effective filing date of September 5, 2003.

The Examiner has stated that claims 4 and 9 and embodiments of claims 1 and 2 (double-wall carbon nanotubes and multi-wall carbon nanotubes), claim 7 (supercritical fluids) and claim 8 (organic solvents and supercritical fluids) have an effective filing date of September 2, 2004. Applicants accept the effective filing date of claims 4 and 9 and the stated embodiments of claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 without traverse.

The Examiner has also stated that claim 6 has an effective filing date of September 2, 2004. Applicants respectfully traverse this finding by the Examiner. Claim 6 has been cited by the Examiner as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and is presently amended (see below). Claim 6, as presently amended, includes verbiage from the specification consistent with the intent of this claim as originally filed. Applicants respectfully assert that there is sufficient support in United States provisional patent application 60/500,394 to justify a priority date of September 5, 2003 for this claim. For example, the "Description of the invention" found on page 1 of United States provisional patent application 60/500,394 states the "[if] partly or fully separated nanotube samples are used, then one can prepare inks that have distinct wavelengths of excitation and emission."

IV. Informalities and Objection to the Specification

The Examiner has stated that the status of United States patent application 10/379,273 cited on page 8 of the specification needs to be updated. Applicants have amended the specification in paragraph [0032] beginning on page 7 and continuing on page 8 to update the status of this patent.

The Examiner has stated that the publication number for PCT/US04/24507 cited on page 8 of the specification is required. Applicants have amended the specification in paragraph [0034] on page 8 to provide the PCT publication number.

The Examiner has objected to the specification for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner has stated that the subject matter of claim 5 is not found in the specification. The Examiner has also stated that there is no teaching in the specification that one of the additives is a polymeric material as recited in claim 9.

Applicants have amended claims 5 and 9. Existing subject matter in the specification provides these claims with proper antecedent support. In view of the amendments to claims 5 and 9, the Examiner's objection to the specification is moot.

As amended, claim 5 reads as follows:

5. The fluorescent ink of Claim 3, wherein the fluorescent carbon nanotubes comprise an essentially homogenous population of carbon nanotubes;
wherein the essentially homogenous population comprises a property selected from the group consisting of type, dimension, or species.

Applicants have amended claim 9 to remove polymeric material from the listing of additives.

As amended, claim 9 reads as follows:

9. The fluorescent ink of Claim 3, further comprising an additive selected from the group consisting of traditional fluorescent inks, dyes, binders, nanoparticles, magnetic materials, and combinations thereof.

Applicants have also added new claim 78, which states that the fluorescent inks further comprise a polymer.

V. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has stated that claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Office Action page 6.

The Examiner has stated that claim 1 states that nanotubes are "operable for undergoing photoluminescence". The Examiner has stated that this phrase is not used in the specification and it is unclear what is meant by this phrase. The Examiner has also stated that claim 1 refers to a predetermined range of emission wavelengths, but this phrase is indefinite since it is not defined or used in the specification. The Examiner has also stated that the phrase "formulated for adhesion to a substrate" is not used in the specification, and it is unclear what is meant by this phrase.

The Examiner has stated that claim 6 is indefinite in meaning. The Examiner has stated that the subject matter of this claim is not found in the specification, and it cannot be clarified what is meant by this claim.

As amended, claim 1 reads as follows:

- 1 A fluorescent ink comprising:
 - suspended carbon nanotubes; and
 - a solvent;
 - wherein the suspended carbon nanotubes comprise fluorescent carbon nanotubes;
 - wherein the fluorescent carbon nanotubes have a visible excitation and an emission following the visible excitation; and

wherein fluorescent ink is deposited on a surface; and
wherein the solvent is evaporated from the surface.

As amended, claim 6 reads as follows:

6. The fluorescent ink of Claim 3, wherein the fluorescent carbon nanotubes comprise separated carbon nanotubes;
wherein the separated carbon nanotubes have fluorescence properties tuned within a range of excitation and emission wavelengths.

Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1 and 6, as amended, comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, at least because the claim terms that the Examiner cited as indefinite no longer appear in those claims. Furthermore, as set forth previously, the specification provides adequate support for the claims as amended. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

VI. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has made various rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Office Action pages 7 – 8. First, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a or b) as anticipated by JP 2003-026981. Office Action page 7. Second, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by United States Patent 6,330,939 (hereinafter, the '939 patent). Office Action page 7. Third, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by published United States Patent Application 2002/0025490 (hereinafter, the '490 patent application). Office Action page 7. Fourth, claims 1 – 3 and 7 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by United States Patent 7,097,788 (hereinafter, the '788 patent). Office Action page 8. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Rejection of Claim 1 Based on JP 2003-026981

The Examiner has stated that JP 2003-026981 teaches an ink printed on paper and comprising a dispersion of carbon nanotubes. The Examiner has stated that the carbon nanotubes are inherently photoluminescent and emit a pre-determined wavelength when irradiated with visible light. The Examiner has stated that if the carbon nanotubes taught by JP 2003-026981 are single-wall carbon nanotubes, the rejection is based on 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a). The Examiner has stated that if the carbon nanotubes taught by JP 2003-026981 are double-wall carbon nanotubes, multi-wall carbon nanotubes,

or mixtures of single-wall nanotubes with other nanotubes, the rejection is based on 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b).

JP 2003-026981 teaches a water-in-oil or oil-in-water emulsion of carbon nanotubes formulated as an ink used for mimeograph printing. The reference teaches use of carbon nanotubes as a colorant in the ink (see JP 2003-026981, paragraph [0008]).

As amended, Applicants' claim 1 describes fluorescent inks comprising fluorescent carbon nanotubes, which have a visible excitation and an emission following the visible excitation. At a minimum, JP 2003-026981 does not teach fluorescent emission of carbon nanotubes. Rather, JP 2003-026981 teaches carbon nanotubes as colorant. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's assertion that the carbon nanotubes of JP 2003-026981 are inherently photoluminescent is invalid. As is well established in the art, carbon nanotube fluorescence is particularly dependent on the nanotube's dispersion, diameter and chirality. For example, semiconducting but not metallic single-wall carbon nanotubes display fluorescence. Therefore, it is not inherent that the carbon nanotubes of JP 2003-026981 are fluorescent.

An anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires each claim element to be present in the cited art either expressly or inherently. M.P.E.P. § 2131, *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since JP 2003-026981 at least does not expressly or inherently teach carbon nanotube fluorescence, Applicants assert patentability over this reference. Claims 2 – 10 and 76 – 80 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 102(a or b) in view of the foregoing remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 1 Based on the '939 Patent

The Examiner has stated that the '939 patent teaches an ink printed on a substrate and comprising a dispersion of carbon nanotubes. The Examiner has stated that the carbon nanotubes are inherently photoluminescent and emit a pre-determined wavelength when irradiated with visible light..

The '939 patent teaches "smart inks" comprising carbon nanotubes, which are applied to currency as a security feature. The inks utilize the electrical and magnetic properties of the carbon

nanotubes to provide regions of enhanced electrical permittivity. The regions of enhanced electrical permittivity are read when the security features of the "smart inks" are utilized.

As amended, Applicants' claim 1 describes fluorescent inks comprising fluorescent carbon nanotubes, which have a visible excitation and an emission following the visible excitation. At a minimum, the '939 patent does not teach fluorescent emission of carbon nanotubes. Rather, the '939 patent teaches that the carbon nanotubes confer enhanced electrical permittivity. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's assertion that the carbon nanotubes of the '939 patent are inherently photoluminescent is invalid. As is well established in the art, carbon nanotube fluorescence is particularly dependent on the nanotube's dispersion, diameter and chirality. For example, semiconducting but not metallic single-wall carbon nanotubes display fluorescence. Therefore, it is not inherent that the carbon nanotubes of the '939 patent are fluorescent.

An anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires each claim element to be present in the cited art either expressly or inherently. M.P.E.P. § 2131, *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the '939 patent at least does not expressly or inherently teach carbon nanotube fluorescence, Applicants assert patentability over this reference. Claims 2 – 10 and 76 – 80 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.PQ.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) in view of the foregoing remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 1 Based on the '490 Patent Application

The Examiner has stated that the '490 patent application teaches an ink printed on a substrate and comprising a dispersion of carbon nanotubes. The Examiner has stated that the carbon nanotubes are inherently photoluminescent and emit a pre-determined wavelength when irradiated with visible light.

The '490 patent application teaches liquid or powder inks comprising carbon nanotubes. The inks are applied to articles, and the Raman spectra of the carbon nanotubes are detected. The inks are utilized as a security feature by detecting the Raman spectra.

As amended, Applicants' claim 1 describes fluorescent inks comprising fluorescent carbon nanotubes, which have a visible excitation and an emission following the visible excitation. At a

minimum, the '490 patent application does not teach fluorescent emission of carbon nanotubes. Rather, the '490 patent application teaches measuring the Raman spectra of the carbon nanotubes. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's assertion that the carbon nanotubes of the '490 patent application are inherently photoluminescent is invalid. As is well established in the art, carbon nanotube fluorescence is particularly dependent on the nanotube's dispersion, diameter and chirality. For example, semiconducting but not metallic single-wall carbon nanotubes display fluorescence. Therefore, it is not inherent that the carbon nanotubes of the '490 patent application are fluorescent.

An anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires each claim element to be present in the cited art either expressly or inherently. M.P.E.P. § 2131, *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the '490 patent application at least does not expressly or inherently teach carbon nanotube fluorescence, Applicants assert patentability over this reference. Claims 2 – 10 and 76 – 80 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) in view of the foregoing remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 1 – 3 and 7 – 10 Based on the '788 Patent

The Examiner has stated the '788 patent teaches an ink printed on a substrate and comprising a dispersion of carbon nanotubes. The Examiner has stated that the carbon nanotubes are dispersed in a mixture or binder and a solvent. The Examiner has stated that the inks can also contain surfactants and dyes. The Examiner has stated that the carbon nanotubes can be SWNTs, DWNTs, or MWNTs. The Examiner has stated that the carbon nanotubes are inherently photoluminescent and emit a near-IR wavelengths when irradiated with visible light. The Examiner has stated that the solvent can be water, organic solvents, and mixtures thereof.

The '788 patent teaches applying a carbon nanotube ink to a substrate and then orienting the carbon nanotubes in the applied ink to increase electrical conductivity. For example, the carbon nanotubes may be oriented by stretching, rubbing, or electrical polarization. The inks are utilized for enzymatic electrochemical sensors.

As amended, Applicants' claim 1 describes fluorescent inks comprising fluorescent carbon nanotubes, which have a visible excitation and an emission following the visible excitation. At a minimum, the '788 patent at least does not teach fluorescent emission of carbon nanotubes. Rather, the

'788 patent teaches oriented carbon nanotubes having electrical conductivity. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's assertion that the carbon nanotubes of the '788 patent are inherently photoluminescent is invalid. As is well established in the art, carbon nanotube fluorescence is particularly dependent on the nanotube's dispersion, diameter and chirality. For example, semiconducting but not metallic single-wall carbon nanotubes display fluorescence. Therefore, it is not inherent that the carbon nanotubes of the '788 patent are fluorescent.

An anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires each claim element to be present in the cited art either expressly or inherently. M.P.E.P. § 2131, *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since the '788 patent does not expressly or inherently teach carbon nanotube fluorescence, Applicants assert patentability over this reference. Claims 2 – 10 and 76 – 80 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 – 3 and 7 – 10 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) in view of the foregoing remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '490 patent application in combination with *O'Connell et al.*, ("Band Gap Fluorescence from Individual Single-Walled Carbon Nanotubes," *Science* 2002:297, pp. 593 – 596, hereinafter, *O'Connell*). Office Action pages 8 – 9. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner has stated that the '490 patent application teaches the claimed ink, as discussed above for the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection. The Examiner has stated that the '490 patent application teaches ink compositions in which the carbon nanotubes are dispersed. The Examiner has stated the '490 patent application teaches a liquid medium, a polymeric binder, and optional surfactants or dyes. The Examiner has stated that the '490 patent application teaches that the carbon nanotubes are Raman-active. The Examiner has stated that *O'Connell* teaches that SWNTs with a diameter of 0.7 – 1.1 nm are Raman-active. The Examiner has stated that it would have been evident to one of ordinary skill in the art to use SWNTs having a diameter of 0.7 – 1.1 nm as the carbon nanotubes in the ink taught by

the '490 patent application. Therefore, the Examiner has asserted that the '490 patent application in combination with *O'Connell* suggests the claimed ink.

The '490 patent application teaches liquid or powder inks containing Raman-active compounds. The Raman-active compounds can comprise carbon nanotubes. The inks are applied to articles, and the Raman spectra are detected. The inks are utilized as a security feature by detecting their Raman spectra.

O'Connell teaches that carbon nanotubes having diameters between 0.7 and 1.1 nm are Raman-active (p. 594, column 3, paragraph 1). Further, *O'Connell* teaches that single-wall carbon nanotubes of this diameter are fluorescent with an emission in the near-infrared after a visible excitation (p. 595, column 2, paragraph 2). *O'Connell* teaches that the single-wall carbon nanotubes are suspended inside micelles in a surfactant solution to provide individual single-wall carbon nanotubes. Further, *O'Connell* teaches that fluorescence is quenched by aggregation of the isolated carbon nanotubes into bundles (p. 593, Abstract). *O'Connell* teaches that quenching of fluorescence is due to interaction of metallic carbon nanotubes within bundles with semiconducting carbon nanotubes.

Applicants assert that the '490 patent application and *O'Connell* do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, as amended, either singularly or in combination. First, the '490 patent application does not teach or suggest that the carbon nanotubes may be fluorescent. Only detection of the carbon nanotubes by Raman spectroscopy is taught by the '490 patent application. Second, neither the '490 patent application nor *O'Connell* teach or suggest that carbon nanotubes are fluorescent when deposited on a surface and the solvent is evaporated. *O'Connell* teaches fluorescence in a micelle solution. As understood by Applicants, *O'Connell* actually teaches away from surface fluorescence of Applicants' disclosure by stating that the fluorescence is quenched by aggregation of isolated carbon nanotubes into bundles (p. 593, Abstract). It is well established in the art that carbon nanotubes aggregate into bundles due to strong van der Waals interactions between individual nanotubes when the carbon nanotubes are not individualized in solution. Since *O'Connell* teaches that carbon nanotube fluorescence is quenched in aggregated carbon nanotubes, there is no motivation to combine the '490 patent application and *O'Connell* to provide a carbon nanotube fluorescent ink. According to *O'Connell*, such an ink would be non-fluorescent when deposited on a surface and the solvent evaporated.

For rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by

the prior art to establish obviousness. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Applicants respectfully assert that the '490 patent application and *O'Connell* do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, as amended, either separately or in combination. Claims 2 – 10 and 76 – 80 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 – 5 and 7 – 10 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) in view of the foregoing remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

VIII. New Claims

Claims 76 – 80 are new claims. Support in the specification for the new claims has been established hereinabove in the Amendments to the Claims section. Claims 76, 77, 79 and 80 claim elements disclosed in the specification but not included in the previous listing of the claims. New claim 78 has been added in response to the Examiner's objection to the specification for material in original claim 9. Claim 78 has been written to properly recite that the ink further comprises a polymer, rather than the polymeric material being an additive as originally recited in claim 9.

CONCLUSIONS

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 – 10 and 76 – 80 are in a condition for allowance based on the remarks and amendments presented above.

If additional fees are due and are not included, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 23-2426 of Winstead PC (referencing matter 11321-P075WOUS).

If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this paper or the present application in general, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 713-650-2764.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD PC

Attorney/Agent for Applicants

Date: December 8, 2008

By: /Robert C. Shaddox/
Robert C. Shaddox, Reg. No. 34,011
Farhang Amini, Ph.D., Reg. No. 59,412

P. O. Box 50748
Dallas, Texas 75201
Tel: 713.650.2764
Fax: 214.745.5390